

**STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN PEER DIALOGUE
AT THE THIRD YEAR OF AL-KAUTSAR
ISLAMIC BOARDING SCHOOL
KULIM - PEKANBARU**

A Thesis
Submitted to Fulfill One of Requirements
for Bachelor Degree in English Education
(S.Pd.)



BY

**AKMAL KHAIRI
NIM. 10514000261**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

**STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN PEER DIALOGUE
AT THE THIRD YEAR OF AL-KAUTSAR
ISLAMIC BOARDING SCHOOL
KULIM - PEKANBARU**



BY

AKMAL KHAIRI

NIM. 10514000261

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

This thesis entitled “*Students’ Participation in Peer Dialogue at the Third Year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru*” is written by Akmal Khairi NIM. 10514000261. It is accepted and approved to be examined in the meeting of the final examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, Rabiul Akhir 19, 1433 H
Maret 14, 2012 M

Approved by

The Chairperson of English
Education Department

Supervisor

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Drs. H. Thamrin, M.Si.

EXAMINER APPROVAL

The thesis entitled “*The Students’ Participation in Peer Dialogue at the Third Year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru*” is written by Akmal Khairi, NIM. 10514000261 It has been approved and examined by the final examination committee of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau on Jumadil Awal 17, 1433H/April 09, 2012 M as one of the requirements for getting undergraduate degree (S.Pd.) in English Education Department.

Pekanbaru, Jumadil Awal 17, 1433 H

April 09, 2012 M

Examination Committee

Chairperson

Secretary

Prof. Dr. H. Salfen Hasri, M.Pd.

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Examiner I

Examiner II

Drs. M. Syafi’i S, M.Pd.

Riri Fauzana, S.Pd.,M.Sc.

Dean

Faculty of Education and Teacher Training

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.

NIP. 197002221997032001

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The greatest gratitude is due to Allah Almighty, the lord of universe who has given his blessing and guidance to the writer to accomplish his thesis. Then the writer addresses Prophet Muhammad SAW (Peace be Upon Him). This thesis is written and intended to fulfill one of the requirements for getting an undergraduate Degree in Department of English Education Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

The writer wants to acknowledge and express his sincere gratitude to Allah SWT and to the following people for their valuable contributions:

1. Prof. Dr. H. M. Nazir, as the Rector of State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M. Ag, as the Dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau for her kindness and encouragement.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M. Pd, as the Chief of English Education Department Education of Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau for her kindness, support and encouragement.
4. Drs. H. Thamrin, M.Si, as the Supervisor of this thesis, who has supervised and given his excellent suggestions and support during the accomplishment of this thesis.
5. All lecturers who have taught and given their knowledge to the writer during his study at English Department of UIN SUSKA Riau.

6. My beloved parents, Mariatun and Jamian, who always be the best parents ever in the world.
7. My brother; Febrianto Saputra, my sisters Nurhidayati, and Bella Komalasari, my big family, my beloved aunts, uncle, and grandparents. Thank a lot for your support.
8. All my friends; Okmi, Ayi Syahrini, and all of the people that I cannot mention one by one, who have given their help, support and valuable input.

Finally, I realize that this thesis is not perfect yet. Therefore, constructive critics, comments and suggestions will be very much appreciated. May Allah Almighty bless us, amin.

Pekanbaru, Januari 27, 2012

The writer,

AKMAL KHAIRI

LIST OF CONTENTS

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL	i
EXAMINER APPROVAL	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A. Background	1
B. Definition of the Terms	4
C. Problem	5
1. Identification of the Problem	5
2. Limitation of the Problems	5
3. Formulation of the Problem	
D. Objective and the Significance of the Research.....	6
1. Objective of the Research.....	6
2. Significance of the Research.....	6

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Framework	7
1. Cooperative Learning	7
2. Nature of Participation	8
3. Nature of Participation in Learning.....	11
4. Factors Influence Participation in Learning	13
5. Peer Dialogue	17

6. Advantages of Peer Dialogue Activities	18
7. Teacher's Role in Peer Dialogue.....	23
8. Procedures of Peer Dialogue in Learning	25
B. Relevant Research.....	26
C. Operational Concepts	27

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design.....	31
B. Location and Time of the Research.....	31
C. Subject and Object The Research.....	31
D. Population and Sample.....	31
E. Techniques of Data Collecting.....	32
F. Technique of Data Analysis.....	33

CHAPTER IV DATA PRESENTATION AND DESCRIPTION

A. Data Presentation	35
B. Data Analysis	57

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion	62
B. Suggestion	62

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

ABSTRACT

This paper entitled: “Students’ Participation in Peer Dialogue at the Third Year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru”

This is a descriptive research. The researcher investigated the students’ participation in peer dialogue during teaching and learning process in the classroom.

Students’ participation can be categorized into four categories namely: bank of knowledge, where the students expect the teacher or their peers to be the source of information and they only give minimal contribution in order to get the information; civil attention – in which the students pretend to pay attention to the class activities in order to mask the truth that they are not focus in the teaching and learning process; interactive facilitative orientation – the students participate in order to facilitate and give the maximum contribution to the classroom activities; and the last is knowledge transmission - where the students use and contribute to the classroom activities in order to get the knowledge that will be needed in the examination. The researcher only focused on three kinds of participation, they are: 1) bank of knowledge, 2) Civil attention, and 3) Knowledge transmission. And the researcher investigate the students’ participation in peer dialogue based on the indicators given in each of the factor.

The data collection technique is by using questionnaire adopted from Almanzor (2009) which consist of thirty questions. The options of the questions are categorized into Likert scale. In order to analyze the data, the researcher used the formula as follows:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the participation of the third year students of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School is categorized as *enough* because the result of the data calculation showed that the average percentage of students’ participation is 60.09. This range is in *enough* category (60-79). When the result is analyzed based on the factors of the participation, it is found that the third year students of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru participate mostly in “civil attention category”, even though the level of their participation is enough, but some of the students still do not pay attention and do other things as the mask to show that they are participating in peer dialogue.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini berjudul: “Partisipasi Siswa dalam Peer Dialogue pada Kelas Tiga Pesantren Al-Kautsar Kulim - Pekanbaru”

Ini adalah sebuah penelitian deskriptif. Tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menginvestigasi tingkat partisipasi siswa dalam peer dialogue selama proses belajar mengajar di ruangan kelas.

Partisipasi siswa bisa dibagi menjadi empat kategori, yaitu : bank of knowledge, dimana siswa mengharapkan guru atau teman-temannya sebagai sumber informasi dan siswa tersebut memberikan kontribusi atau partisipasi yang minimal untuk mendapatkan informasi tersebut. Jenis partisipasi yang kedua adalah civil attention, yaitu dimana siswa berpura-pura memperhatikan pelajaran atau berpartisipasi dalam pelajaran dalam tingkat yang sangat minimum. Partisipasi dalam faktor interactive facilitative orientation adalah partisipasi yang paling tinggi dimana siswa berpartisipasi dalam peer dialogue dengan tujuan untuk memberikan kontribusi dan memfasilitasi proses belajar bersama dengan teman, dan jenis partisipasi terakhir adalah knowledge transmission, yaitu siswa berpartisipasi agar bisa mempersiapkan diri dalam menghadapi ujian atau test yang akan mempengaruhi nilai siswa tersebut. Peneliti fokus menginvestigasi tiga faktor partisipasi, yaitu 1) bank of knowledge, 2) civil attention, dan 3) Knowledge transmission.

Teknik pengumpulan data dalam penelitian ini adalah dengan menggunakan angket yang diadopsi dari Almanzor (2009) yang terdiri dari tiga puluh pertanyaan, dengan sepuluh pertanyaan untuk tiap faktor. Pilihan jawaban dari pertanyaan tersebut dikategorikan berdasarkan skala Likert. Dalam rangka menganalisa data, peneliti menggunakan rumus berikut:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

Berdasarkan hasil analisa data, bisa ditarik kesimpulan bahwa partisipasi siswa kelas tiga pondok pesantren Al-Kautsar Kulim – Pekanbaru berada dalam kategori *sedang*. Angka partisipasi siswa adalah 60.90 dan ini berada dalam range kategori *sufficient*, yaitu (60 – 79). Bisa disimpulkan bahwa siswa telah memberikan perhatian dalam pelajaran, tetapi perhatian yang diberikan masih belum maksimum.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE II. 1	The five facets of Characteristics of Collaborative Models.....	18
TABLE III.1	Population and Samples of Research	31
TABLE III.2	Scale of the Score.....	32
TABLE III.3	Distribution of Questionnaire.....	33
TABLE III.4	Students' Participation in Peer Dialogue	34
TABLE IV.1	The students listen to the instructions carefully before conducting peer dialogue	35
TABLE IV.2	The student always takes down notes during peer dialogue and discussion	36
TABLE IV.3	The students raise their hand to ask questions in peer dialogue .	36
TABLE IV.4	The student contributes to the to the classroom activities by reciting or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class.....	37
TABLE IV.5	The student participates in peer dialogue despite the size of the class.....	38
TABLE IV.6	The student practice peer dialogue despite unclear concept of topic in the class	38
TABLE IV.7	The students actively answer the friends' question during peer dialogue	39
TABLE IV.8	The students make comment during peer dialogue only when the teacher invites the class to do so	40
TABLE IV.9	The student answers the question, even though the question was directed to someone else	40
TABLE IV.10	The students comment aloud, even though the chance was given to someone else	41
TABLE IV.11	The students make efforts in attending class on time	42
TABLE IV.12	The students keep quiet during lesson time and peer dialogue	

	Time.....	42
TABLE IV.13	The students doodle or draw in their books while peer dialogue is going on	43
TABLE IV.14	The students prefer written assignment than performing peer dialogue	44
TABLE IV.15	The students daydream during peer dialogue or class activities .	44
TABLE IV.16	The students wait for the teacher to call them to recite or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class	45
TABLE IV.17	The students prefer to listen to other students' conversation rather than perform the dialogue	46
TABLE IV.18	The students talk to seatmates about other things than the lesson.....	46
TABLE IV.19	The students read other texts during peer dialogue.....	47
TABLE IV.20	The students try to maintain eye contact with the peer while performing peer dialogue	48
TABLE IV.21	The students listen attentively in class as a form of self-review	48
TABLE IV.22	The students have the material that will be used in the lesson....	49
TABLE IV.23	The students take down notes that consist important vocabularies during peer dialogue	49
TABLE IV.24	The students ask the teacher when they do not understand the lesson	50
TABLE IV.25	The students listen and repeat the teacher's example during peer dialogue	51
TABLE IV.26	The students correct other students' mistaken definitions of key terms.....	51
TABLE IV.27	The students listen well and mentally repeat when the teacher explains the concept or the lesson	52

TABLE IV.28	The students tell others if they make mistakes while performing peer dialogue	53
TABLE IV.29	The students talk and make noise while memorizing the terminologies or phrases in peer dialogue	54
TABLE IV.30	The students write the vocabularies and dialogue of peer dialogue accurately in order to avoid misunderstanding.....	54
TABLE IV.31	Bank of knowledge	55
TABLE IV.32	Civil Attention.....	56
TABLE IV.33	Knowledge Transmission.....	56
TABLE IV.34	Scale of the Score.....	57
TABLE IV.35	Students' response for bank of knowledge category.....	59
TABLE IV.36	Students' Responses for Civil Attention Category.....	60
TABLE IV.37	Students' Response for Knowledge Transmission Category.....	60

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Problem

Students seek other students, they have fun together and they learn spontaneously from each other in many different situations. When new students come to an established group, many situations occur where we can see how the students who are already familiar with the context and its demands, are able to help, collaborate with, and teach other students to find their place and learn how to behave and solve different tasks. At school, they may be talking about activities, ranging from teaching another pupil how to solve a problem, to showing or helping a peer to understand the learning material. School is an arena where pupils meet peers in a natural way, and which contextualize the greater part of pupil's social lives with other pupils, but also a place where there are pupils of different ages who could be acting as "teachers" for the other pupils.¹ Students learn through interactions with others; that is, they socially construct knowledge when learning the ways, practices, and value systems of their culture.²

The goal of teaching English is to prepare the students to enable them communicate in English well. Psychologists and educationalists influenced by Vygotsky claim that pupils working in small groups can share, and evaluate ideas and develop their critical thinking (Norman, 1992; Sharan and Shaulov, 1989; Webb and Cullian, 1983; Wells et al., 1990; Wood, 1988). The seminal work of

¹ James (et.al) in Maurier, *Peer Dialogue in Literacy Center*, 2008, p 17.

² *Ibid*

Barnes and Todd in Corden highlights the learning potential of peer group discussions which is reflective and hypothetical and where speech is tentative and exploratory. However, although organizing pupils into groups may increase their potential for discourse, it does not mean they will automatically discuss issues collaboratively.³

This argument is also strengthen by Brown defined that interaction is the collaborative exchange of thought, feelings between two or more people resulting in reciprocal effect on each other.⁴ It clearly indicated that learning cannot be ignored without the presence of the other people to interact.

Students need to interact with other students in order to practice what they have learned from the material or the lesson. Unless the class is very small one, the teacher will never be able to give the students enough oral practice through whole class work. Suppose that the class has thirty students and this is the average number of students in each class, and the teacher does oral work for thirty minutes of the lesson. Then each student will be able to talk for one minute at the most – even if they do all the talking. On the other hand, if the students are divided into pairs for just five minutes, each student will get more talking time during those five minutes than during the rest of the lesson. From this point of view, pair work or peer work is absolutely essential.

As the writer conducted observations in Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School, the students are required to practice english in their daily life. This

³ Corden, Roy. 2001. *Group Discussion and The Importance of A Shared Perspective: Learning from Collaborative Research*. Sage Publication, p.347.

⁴ Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, Pearson Education, p. 246.

program is called as “The English Week” which is required from Tsanawiyah students since the second grade. The program is also supported by other programs such as the program after morning prayers in which students are taught the procedures in speaking called “English Conversation”, and also in the teaching and learning process for the subject related to English lesson, teachers are also encouraged to explain the lesson in English. There also some programs that teach the students to speak in three languages, including English, which is held every Friday night. In this program, the students are also taught English grammar and how to speak fluently. But, the result of the program shows that most of the students of Al-Kautsar still have trouble to practice the language eventhought they schools already provided the opportunity to interact with other students in order to practice their English. It can be seen on the phenomena as follows:

- a. Most of the students are still unable to participate in peer-dialogue during English lesson.
- b. Most of the students are not able to answer the questions given by their peers.
- c. Most of the students are not able to ask questions related to the lesson or the peers.
- d. Most of the students are not able to express their opinion in the conversation with their peers.
- e. Some students seem to be the silent participants although they are asked to respond and ask questions.

Based on the phenomena above, the writer is interested in conducting a research entitled **“Students’ Participation in Peer-Dialogue at the Third Year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru”**

B. Definition of the Terms

In order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation toward the content of this research, the definitions of technical terms are viewed clearly as follows:

1. Participation; based on www.thefreedictionary.com⁵ participation is defined as the act of taking part or sharing something, or the act of sharing in the activities of a group. Keith Davis defined participation as the mental and emotional engagement of someone in giving the efforts in order to achieve a goal. It can be inferred that the participation in this research is the students’ engagement in mental and emotional while taking part in the dialogue or sharing something in the peer-dialogue.⁶

George Terry in Winardi stated that participation is the students’ engagement physically or mentally in giving their contribution in making decision, and their responsibility toward the groups where they belong.⁷

In short, participation in this research can be defined as the students’ action or contribution during teaching and learning process that demonstrates their contribution in order to gain the goal of learning and teaching.

1. Dialogue; based on www.thefreedictionary.com. Dialogue is a conversation between two or more people in order to exchange opinions on a particular

⁵ www.thefreedictionary.com/participation.htm [10/8/2011]

⁶ Keith Davis is Sakdiyah, *Pengaruh Motivasi, Disiplin, dan Partisipasi Siswa dalam Pembelajaran terhadap Prestasi Belajar Akuntansi Siswa*. 2006, p. 34

⁷ George Terry in Winardi, (2002). *Motivasi dan Pemotivasian dalam Manajemen*. Jakarta: PT. Grafindo Persada, in Sakdiyah (2006) p.35.

subject. And Peer is a person who has equal standing with another or others, as in rank, class, or age; a peer is an equal in age, skill or other category. In short, peer-dialogue is the conversation between the student and their friends in learning English in order to exchange information and opinions.

C. Problems

1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the background above, the problems of the research can be identified as the followings:

- a. Why most of the students are still unable to participate in peer-dialogue during English lesson.
- b. Why most of the students are not able to answer the questions given by their peers.
- c. Why most of the students are not able to ask questions related to the lesson or the peers.
- d. Why most of the students are not able to express their opinion in the conversation with their peers.
- e. What factors that make some students seem to be the silent participants although they are asked to respond and ask questions.

2. The Limitation of the Problem

In this research, it is essential to limit the problems. The problem is limited into the investigation about the students' participation in peer dialogue at the third

year students of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim - Pekanbaru during the English learning and teaching process.

3. The Formulation of the Problem

The problem of this research is formulated into following questions:

How is the students' participation in peer dialogue at the third year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru?

D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research

1. The Objective of the Research

The objective of the research is to find out the students' participation in peer dialogue during at the third year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru.

2. The Significance of the Research

The writer expects that this research can:

- a. Give the information to the English teacher of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School about the students' participation in learning English by using peer-dialogue.
- b. Enlarge the writer's knowledge about real English teaching and learning process.
- c. Fulfill one of the requirements of undergraduate degree in English Education Department of State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Framework

1. Cooperative Learning

In recent years there has been focus on cooperative learning as an instruction method to increase the likelihood of academic achievement of students; however, cooperative learning is not a new method of teaching and learning, as it has existed since humans began learning. Stevens says, “Early uses of cooperative learning certainly occurred in one-room schoolhouses, where one teacher was forced to teach students with a range of abilities”.¹

Cooperative learning in school occurs when students work together in a group to master material presented by the teacher. More proficient students tutor less proficient students and, as a result, one of the most important purposes of cooperative learning is to improve students’ learning in the classroom. Klingner, Vaughn & Schumm defined cooperative learning as “students working together in small groups on a clearly defined task that requires the participation of everyone in the group”.² From the same aspect, Johnson & Johnson defined cooperative learning as “the instructional uses of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each others’ learning”.³

¹ Steven R in C. N. Hedley, & A.N. Baratta. *Literacy: A redefinition* (pp. 127-158). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

² Klingner, J.K., Vaughn, S. & Schumm, J.S. (1998). *Collaborative strategic reading during social studies in heterogonous fourth-grade classroom*. p. 5.

³ Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Structure Academic Controversy*. pp. 5. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

2. The Nature of Participation

According to Vygotsky, the higher mental development of human beings appears first on the social level, between individuals, and later on the individual level, inside the child. In addition, he emphasizes language as a mediational tool for higher mental development.⁴ Thus, language is used as a powerful mediational tool between learners (at the interpsychological level) and within individuals (at the intrapsychological level).

When Collaborative Dialogues and language Learning: the learners work together, these strengths and weaknesses may be pooled, creating a greater expertise for the group than of any of the individuals involved. McDonough showed that learners who had taken part in pair and group activities showed improved production of the target forms, even though they did not consider the interaction activities as a useful method for learning the language.⁵ Kim mentioned the effectiveness of collaborative work on language vocabulary acquisition.⁶ In sum, for language learners, this peer interaction can provide scaffolded assistance to each other within their relative zone of proximal development and thus peer interaction promotes language learning.

Several studies have found that the patterns of interaction vary across peer groups, and certain patterns of interaction are claimed to be more conducive to language learning than others. These studies have found not only the differences

⁴ Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. In Kim Tae Young and Hyo Sun Seo. *Collaborative Dialogue and L2 Learning*. Korean Journal Vol 27. March 2011. P. 345

⁵ *Ibid*

⁶ Kim Tae Young (2011) *Collaborative Dialogue and L2 Learning*. Korean Journal Vol. 27, March 2011, p. 350.

in the patterns of pair behavior but also more conducive patterns of interaction to language learning. For example, Storch examined that not all peer-peer interaction provided an occasion for learning and collaborative pattern and expert-novice pattern of interaction showed more scaffolded.⁷

Learning is an individual process, which involves the motivation of the learners in order to learn. The learners will be motivated to learn if they could see the relevancy of learning experience to their needs in the real life, and students will be highly motivated to learn if they could get the feedback from their learning environment. This is because learning is an intellectual and emotional process.

Corden argues that the students working in small groups can share and evaluate ideas and develop their critical thinking.⁸ The seminal work of Barnes and Todd highlights the learning potential of peer group discussions which are reflective and hypothetical and where speech is tentative and exploratory. However, although organizing pupils into groups may increase their potential for discourse, it does not mean they will automatically discuss issues collaboratively.⁹

Some studies show how the same tasks can generate different responses from pupils in terms of the quality of talk and collaboration that emerge. Evidence from empirical research also confirms Barnes and Todd's view that successful peer-group work depends on pupils having a shared understanding of the purpose of tasks and a joint conception of what they are trying to achieve. However, some studies provide examples of how pupils' interpretations of the ground rules for

⁷ Kim Tae Young (2011) *Collaborative Dialogue and L2 Learning*. Korean Journal Vol. 27, March 2011, p. 351.

⁸ Corden, Roy. 2001. *Group discussion and the importance of a shared perspective: learning from collaborative research*. SAGE Publication. London. P. 347

⁹ *Ibid.*

discussion may differ in important ways from those of their peers and/or teachers. For example, while some pupils working in groups may see it as an opportunity to explore and interrogate texts collaboratively, others in the same group may see it as an opportunity to exhibit individual knowledge and demonstrate an ability to get the correct answers. Moreover, some studies illustrate how pupils' traditional conceptions of school learning contexts and acceptable discourse patterns can inhibit their capacity for collaborative discussion.¹⁰

In order to get the better understanding about participation, the researcher will explain about the kinds of participation based on Keit Davis theories in Sastroputro.¹¹ The participation can be divided into the following categories:

- a. *Psychological participation* is the participation of the students by actively contribute their thoughts in achieving certain goal.
- b. *Physical Participation*, which is the participation of the individual or group by contributing the physically in certain activities.
- c. *Physical and psychological participation*. In this kind of participation, the individual contribute physically and psychologically at the same time in order to obtain the group's goal.
- d. *Participation with skill* is the kind of participation from a personal or group whose specific skills by contributing their special skills toward the achievement of the goal.

¹⁰ Corden, Roy. 2001. *Group discussion and the importance of a shared perspective: learning from collaborative research*. SAGE Publication. London. P. 348

¹¹ Sastroputro, Santoso. (1989) *Partisipasi, Komunikasi, Persuasi dan Disiplin dalam Pembangunan Nasional*. Alumni. Bandung in Sakdiyah, Efa, M. (2006) *Pengaruh Motivasi, Disiplin, dan Partisipasi Siswa dalam Pembelajaran terhadap Prestasi Belajar Akuntansi Siswa*.

- e. *Material participation*, means the participation from a person of group by giving their property or material in order to assist the group to reach the goal.
- f. *Money participation*, can be defined as the participation by giving money in order to support some activities. This kind of participation may take place when the person is unable to take part on the other kind of participation.

3. The Nature of Participation in Learning

Participation is the student's active engagement in the classroom to promote effective learning (Howard, Short, & Clark).¹² The student's activities may include reciting in class, having conversations with the instructor or their classmates or peer dialogue, doing written outputs, and sharing ideas with others. Based on these examples, clearly, a participative learner is one that is not passive. As Fraser defines it (participation) is the extent to which students are encouraged to participate rather than be passive listeners.¹³ Both researchers defined participation then as students who *actively* engage in classroom discussions, rather than be passive learners who simply take in knowledge.

In a classroom-based learning, participation can be a positive feedback given by students to either the lesson or peers or the teacher which can lead to possible ways in the development of an improved classroom learning experience. Because of this, the researchers purposely gave student participation in the classroom setting as their focus. With all the tedious discussions done in the

¹² Howard, Short, Clark in Almanzor, Judith Marianne S, Daguman, (2009),p.38

¹³ *Ibid.*

classrooms, the researchers wanted to find a way to measure how much one student can actually have an interest in participating in peer-dialogue in class.

Howard, Short, and Clark broke down student participation into four factors: (1) bank of knowledge, (2) civil attention, (3) interactive facilitative orientation, and (4) knowledge transmission orientation.¹⁴ The explanation of the items can be seen as follows:

a) Bank of Knowledge

The bank of knowledge typically refers to students who make minimal contributions during peer discussions and get their information from the instructor alone. An example of this kind of participation is students who listen and take down notes during the lesson and do not share their own insights or thoughts with the instructor or the class.

b) Civil Attention

This is similar when students appear to be paying attention in order to mask that they are actually not focused on what is being discussed. An example of this so-called “mask” is when instructors give the task or demonstrate the dialogues, student/s tend to look at the speaker without actually understanding what he/she is saying.

c) Knowledge Transmission Orientation

This factor is manifested when the students tend to memorize material solely for the sake of reproducing it on an examination or test. This is when students focus on the lesson or notes given by the instructor, use the information

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

on the peer-dialogue, and demonstrate it in front of the classroom, but do not remember it after it has been discussed and tested.

d) Interactive Facilitative Orientation

This refers to the “deep learning process” which focuses on the primary subject or topic through the use of materials and outputs. When an instructor gives alternative forms of assessment to the students in order for them to understand one topic which is being discussed, this can be considered as an example of this factor.

Three out of four of these factors show some negativity. Actually, these factors are increasing as to whether or not one student really is an active learner in the classroom setting. In Bank of Knowledge, there is not much classroom participation aside from the fact that the learner is physically present in class. In civil attention, the learner gives some attention to what is happening in class by giving time to glance at the lecturer. In knowledge transmission orientation, learning is happening only to a certain extent which is normally based on the effect of grades to the learner.

A learner can only be said as a fully active class participant if he/she arrives at the level of Interactive Facilitative Orientation. With these subscales, the researchers can find out how affective transformative learning is in the school in terms of student participation in peer-dialogue in class time.

4. Factors that Influence the Students' Participation in Classroom

Alpert¹⁵ found that students resist in the classroom for three reasons: (1) the components of adolescent culture, such in language and interests; (2) upper-

¹⁵*Ibid.*

middle class aspirations for success; and (3) the teaching approach used. Students resisted in four ways: (1) they were either silent (not answering) or mumbling their answers; (2) they argued with their teacher or friends over a topic; (3) they conformed to the rules of the teacher, although they were silent; and (4) resisted the rules which were considered a danger to their grades. The findings show that students' behaviors of resistance are common among other classes because the students feel it is a legitimate medium of expression and reaction in the classroom. It is recommended to not keep the students productive for the entire class time because it will lead to behaviors such as socializing with their classmates, walking around the room, daydreaming, etc.

In addition to the factors which affect student resistance, there are factors which affect the actual participation in the classroom. Crombi stated four factors affect student participation: (1) class size; (2) gender balance; (3) discipline of the course; and (4) instructor behavior. Students in larger classes are more reluctant to participate; in courses which are concerned with arts and social sciences, there is higher student participation than in courses with math and sciences (Crombie, 2003).¹⁶ Lastly, Howard and Henney reported that there were three kinds of verbal contributions of students during class:

- (1) student initiated interactions; Student initiated interactions were the instances where the students interrupted the instructor's discussion to ask a question or make a comment without the invitation to do so.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

(2) instructor initiated interactions; Instructor initiated interactions were the instances where the instructor invites students' comments and questions towards one student and he or she answered, it was considered a direct question. (3) directed questions.¹⁷

Students also enumerated reasons why they would participate in class. The most common answer of the students were that they participated in class was that they were "seeking information or clarification".¹⁸ The other reasons why they participated were that they learned by participating, they have something to contribute to the class, and they enjoy participating. In addition to that, students gave their reasons for non-participation in their class. The reasons are as follows: (1) they felt that their reasons were not well formulated enough; (2) they felt they knew little about the subject matter; (3) they did not do the reading assignment; and (4) the class size was large.

According to Sudjana, the students' participation in learning is categorized as physical and emotional participation.¹⁹ Besides, the participation of the students is influenced by the following factors, namely:

- a. The students' knowledge/cognitive, such as the students' knowledge about the theme of the lesson, the facts, the roles, and their ability to interpret the instruction in learning and teaching process.
- b. The situation, such as the physical environment, social environment, psychosocial, and other social factors.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Sudjana, Nana. 2003. *Teknik Analisis Regresi dan Korelasi (bagi para peneliti)*. Bandung: Tarsito in Sakdiyah, 2006, p. 37

- c. Social habit, such as the needs of approach, and avoidance, and others individual needs.
- d. The attitude, such as the point of view or feeling, the readiness to contribute, the social interaction, motivation and attention.

Keit Davis suggests that the participation can occur in with the following conditions:

- Adequate time to participate

The students can participate if they get enough time to participate and decide that kind of contribution that they have to give. It is almost impossible to participate without any preparation.

- Offer more advantages

If the students can see the advantages of the contribution that they give, they will participate actively in order to get the advantages.

- Relevant to the students' needs

The contribution required must relevant with the students' needs in learning and teaching process.

- Students' ability

The students are interested to contribute in order to get the knowledge or other special skills

- The ability to communicate

- Feel save to contribute and participate in the activities.²⁰

²⁰ Keit Davis, Newstrom in Hayati, (2001, p.18), in Sakdiyah, 2006, p.37.

5. Peer Dialogue

In the classroom, effective collaboration with peers has proven itself a successful and uniquely powerful learning method. Students learn effectively in groups, encourage each other to ask questions, explain and justify their opinions, articulate their reasoning, and elaborate and reflect upon their knowledge.²¹ These benefits, however, are only achieved by active and well-functioning learning teams. Placing students in a group and assigning them a task does not guarantee that the students will engage in effective collaborative learning behavior. While some peer groups seem to interact naturally, others struggle to maintain a balance of participation, leadership, understanding, and encouragement. The most effective instructors teach students not only the cognitive skills necessary to learn the subject matter, but also the social skills they need to communicate well in a team. Students need guidance and support from their peers and instructor.²²

Ideally, the peer would be able to understand and interpret peer-to-peer conversation, and could actively support the group during their learning activities. Such a system, however, would need not only powerful natural language understanding capabilities, but also the knowledge required to advise, support, and guide the group toward maximum effectiveness.

The characteristics studied and seen to be exhibited during effective collaborative learning interaction fall into five categories: participation, social grounding, active learning conversation skills, performance analysis and group

²¹ Amy Soller & Alan Lesgold, *Literacy: Analyzing Peer Dialogue from an Active Learning Perspective* (pp.63-68). Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh

²² *Ibid.*

processing, and promotive interaction. Table II.1 describes, in brief, the characteristics exhibited by effective learning teams for each of the five facets.

Table II.1
The five facets of the Collaborative Models and their corresponding Characteristic

CL Model Facet	Characteristics of Effective Learning
Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the students actively participate in the group's discussion - Peers share their ideas openly
Social Grounding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students establish and maintain a shared understanding and proposed solutions
Active Learning Conversation Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Team members encourage each other to justify their opinions, and articulate and explain their thinking
Performance Analysis & Group Processing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students individually and collectively assess their progress - The team as a whole reflects on its performance.
Promotive Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students verbally promote each other's understanding through support, help and encouragement - Each student receives the help he needs from his peers

6. The Advantages of Peer Dialogue Activities

Long and Porter argued that there are at least five pedagogical arguments for the use of peer dialogue in learning.²³ They concern the potential of peer dialogue for increasing the quantity of language practice opportunities, for improving the quality of student talk, for individualizing instruction, for creating a positive affective climate in the classroom, and for increasing student motivation. We begin with a brief review of those arguments.

1) Peer dialogue increases language practice opportunities.

²³ Long, Micheal H., and Patricia Porter. *Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition*. TESOL Quarterly Vol.19 No. 2. June 1985, p 207 – 225.

In all probability, one of the main reasons for low achievement by many learners is simply that they do not have enough time to practice the new language. This is especially serious in large classes in which students need to develop aural-oral skills. From observational studies of classrooms such as Hoetker and Ahlbrand, and Fanselow, we know that the predominant mode of instruction is what might be termed the *lockstep*, in which one person (the teacher) sets the same instructional pace and content for everyone, by lecturing, explaining a grammar point, leading drill work, or asking questions of the whole class.²⁴

The same studies show that when lessons are organized in this manner, a typical teacher of any subject talks for at least half, and often for as much as two thirds, of any class period Flanders. In a 50-minute lesson, that would leave 25 minutes for the students. However, since 5 minutes is usually spent on administrative matters (getting pupils in and out of the room, calling the roll, collecting and distributing homework assignments, and so on) and (say) 5 minutes on reading and writing, the total time available to students is actually more like 15 minutes. In an EFL class of 30 students in a public secondary school classroom, this averages out to 30 seconds per student per lesson-or just *one hour per student per year*.

To illustrate with the public school setting, suppose that just *half* the time available for individual student talk is devoted to work in groups of three instead of to lockstep practice, in which one student talks while 29 listen (or not, as the case may be). This will change the total *individual* practice time available to each

²⁴ *Ibid.*

student from one hour to about five and a half hours. While still too little, this is an increase of over 500 percent.

2) *Small group work improves the quality of student talk.*

The lockstep limits not only the *quantity* of talk students can engage in, but also its *quality*. This is because teacher-fronted lessons favor a highly conventionalized variety of conversation, one rarely found outside courtrooms, wedding ceremonies, and classrooms. In such settings, one speaker asks a series of *known-information*, or *display*, questions, such as “Do you come to class at nine o'clock?”-questions to which there is usually only one correct answer, already known to both parties. The second speaker responds (*I* do) and then, in the classroom, typically has the correctness of the response confirmed (Yes, Right, or Good). Only rarely does genuine communication take place. (For further depressing details, see, for example, Hoetker and Ahlbrand 1969, Long 1975, Fanselow 1977, Mehan 1979, and Long and Sato 1983).²⁵

An unfortunate but hardly surprising side effect of this sort of pseudo-communication is that students' attention tends to wander. Consequently, teachers maintain a brisk pace to their questions and try to ensure prompt and brief answers in return. This is usually quite feasible, since what the students say requires little thought (the same question often being asked several times) and little language (mostly single phrases or short "sentences"). Teachers quickly "correct" any errors, and students appreciate just as quickly that what they say is less important than how they say it.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

It is unlikely, however, to promote the kind of conversational skills students need outside the classroom, where accuracy is often important but where communicative ability is always at a premium.

Pair work can help a great deal here. First, unlike the lockstep, with its single, distant initiator of talk (the teacher) and its group interlocutor (the students), face-to-face communication in a small group is a natural setting for conversation. Second, two or three students working together for five minutes at a stretch are not limited to producing hurried, isolated "sentences." Rather, they can engage in cohesive and coherent sequences of utterances, thereby developing discourse competence, not just (at best) a sentence grammar. Third, as shown by Long, Adams, McLean, and Castabs, students can take on roles and adopt positions which in lockstep work are usually the teacher's exclusive preserve and can thus practice a range of language functions associated with those roles and positions. While solving a problem concerning the siting of a new school in an imaginary town, for example, they can suggest, infer, qualify, hypothesize, generalize, or disagree.²⁶ In terms of another dimension of conversational management, they can develop such skills-also normally practiced only by the teacher-as topic-nomination, turn-allocation, focusing, summarizing, and clarifying.

Finally, given appropriate materials to work with and problems to solve, students can engage in the kind of information exchange characteristic of communication outside classrooms-with all the creative language use and

²⁶ *Ibid.*

spontaneity this entails-where the focus is on meaning as well as form. In other words, they can in all these ways develop at least some of the variety of skills which make up communicative competence in learning a language.

3) *Small Group work helps individualize instruction*

Small groups of students can work on different sets of materials suited to their needs. Moreover, they can do so simultaneously, thereby avoiding the risk of boring other students who do not have the same problem, perhaps because they speak a different first language, or who do have the same problem but need less time to solve it. Group work, then, is a first step toward individualization of instruction, which everyone agrees is a good idea but which few teachers or textbooks seem to do much about.

4) *Small group work promotes a positive affective climate*

Many students, especially the shy or linguistically insecure, experience considerable stress when called upon in the public arena of the lockstep classroom. This stress is increased by the knowledge that they must respond accurately and above all quickly. Research (for example, Rowe 1974 and White and Lightbown 1983) has shown that if students pause longer than about one second before beginning to respond or while making a response, or (worse) appear not to know the answer, or make an error, teachers will tend to interrupt, repeat, or rephrase the question, ask a different one, "correct," and/or switch to another student. Not all teachers do these things, of course, but most teachers do so more than they realize or would want to admit.

In other words, freedom from the requirement for accuracy at all costs and entry into the richer and more accommodating set of relationships provided by small-group interaction promote a positive affective climate. This in turn allows for the development of the kind of personalized, creative talk for which most aural-oral classes are trying to prepare learners.

5) *Small group work motivates students*

Several advantages have already been claimed for small group work. It allows for a greater quantity and richer variety of language practice, practice that is better adapted to individual needs and conducted in a more positive affective climate. Students are individually involved in lessons more often and at a more personal level. For all these reasons and because of the *variety* of small group work inevitably introduces into a lesson, it seems reasonable to believe that small group work motivates the classroom learner.

Empirical evidence supporting this belief has been provided by several studies reported recently in Littlejohn (1983). It has been found, for example, that small-group, independent study can lead to increased motivation to study Spanish among beginning students; learners responding to a questionnaire reported that they felt less inhibited and freer to speak and make mistakes in the small group than in the teacher-led class.

7. Teacher's Role in Peer Dialogue

Using cooperative learning does not alter the teacher's role in negative ways, such as sitting around and doing nothing in their classroom. Teacher must continue to provide instruction, monitor students' activity, and promote positive

socialization. The teacher's instruction must help students to reach the specific cognitive goals associated with lessons to enhance group discussion; also, the teacher's instruction must deal with cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Meloth and Deering distinguish between content strategies and collaborative strategies as follows:

“Content strategies refer to those that are associated with using and understanding the lesson's content, regardless of whether students will work under individualistic conditions or in collaboration with other peers. Instruction should also inform students about the particular collaborative strategies that can help all group members learn content specific to the lesson”.²⁷

Johnson and Johnson believe that teachers must know how and when to structure students' learning goals cooperatively, competitively, or individually because such structuring is the most important aspect of teaching.²⁸ Moreover, Johnson and Johnson postulated five teacher roles in structuring cooperative learning strategies as follow:

- a. Teachers must determine the objectives for the lesson.
- b. They must distribute students in learning groups before the class is started.
- c. Teachers must explain the task and goal structure to the students.
- d. Teachers must monitor groups during cooperative learning and intervene to assist students when they need assistance to improve interpersonal and group skills.

²⁷ Loc Cit.

²⁸ Johnson and Johnson (1994) in Alhaidari, Mohammed. S., 2006. *The Effectiveness of Using Cooperative Learning to Promote Reading Comprehension, Vocabulary and Fluency Achievement Scores of Male Fourth-and Fifth-Grade Students in A Saudi Arabian School*. Pennsylvania, Unpublished Dissertation.

- e. Teachers must evaluate the achievement of students and provide the evaluation to them.

Cohen believes that teachers must keep their students interdependent, autonomous, and self-directed. To fulfill this, Cohen believes teachers must monitor their students.²⁹ Teacher's monitoring keeps students on-task and working effectively. A short span of monitoring time often is not sufficient, However, Meloth and Barbe, as cited in Chiu, examined teachers' monitoring in fifteen third-grade classrooms and found that teachers did not give students enough help during cooperative learning.

Also, most of the teacher's questions were brief and the teachers often did not listen to students' responses. Therefore, students' discussions of the topic were superficial or were off-task until the teacher returned. Meloth and Deering postulated that when students need scaffolding of complex literacy knowledge, teachers must provide information during monitoring by modeling their own thinking; by using information from the activity to contextualize the how and why of effective communication; and by asking questions that relate to the subject instead of by giving direct answers.³⁰

8. Procedures of Peer Dialogue in Learning English

Byrne divided peer dialogue into two main kinds:

1. Fixed peers

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

This is when the students work with the same partner, usually the chair mate, in order to complete task or some kind of assignment. In this model, the students will practice the short dialogue given by the teacher, afterwards, they may change their roles to repeat the dialogue over.

2. Flexible peer

For this, the students keep changing their partners. To give a simple sample, each student may have to interview several others in order to find out two or three things about the other students. For example, the students will ask their friends the following question, “*Do you like animals?*”, “*Have you got some pets?*”, “*What pets would you like to keep?*”, etc.

B. Relevant Research

1. Mohammed S. Alhaidari carried out a research entitled “*The Effectiveness of Using Cooperative Learning to Promote Reading Comprehension, Vocabulary and Fluency Achievement Scores of Male Fourth and Fifth Grade Students in A Saudi Arabian School*”. The objectives of the research were to investigate the implementation of cooperative learning method in reading, and the teachers’ attitude toward cooperative learning method.³¹

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the use of cooperative learning with fourth and fifth grade students in the ISA would enhance their reading performance as measured by their abilities in comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency within the standard reading

³¹ Mohammed S. Alhaidiri. (2006) *The Effectiveness of Using Cooperative Learning to Promote Reading Comprehension*.

curriculum. The study also sought to measure teachers' attitudes toward cooperative learning. The result showed no significant grade by-treatment interaction on reading performance measures, and students' attitudes and motivation measures. However, the results of the study do show that cooperative learning can positively affect students' performance in vocabulary, fluency on instruction passages, fluency on transfer passages, and attitudes toward working together. The study also found an improvement in teachers' attitudes toward using cooperative learning.

2. Yasir Amri (2005) conducted the research entitled 'The Role of Interlocutors to Students' Speaking Achievement at the Faculty of Education and Teacher's Training of English Education Department of UIN SUSKA Riau'. He took 35 samples of the students and used two variables in the research. In order to obtain the data, he used questionnaire and speaking test. The research finding concluded that there is significant contribution of the interlocutors to the students' speaking achievement.

C. Operational Concepts

Operational concept is the concept used to give an explanation about the theoretical framework in order to avoid misunderstanding toward the research.³²

The researchers decided to revise the previous model to make it more uniform and because of the insignificant value for its Cronbach's alpha.

³² Rihandoyo. 2010. *Kajian Teori dan Operasionalisasi Konsep*. p. 6

The researchers decided to remove the only positive factor, *Interactive Facilitative Orientation*. They equally divided the items of these factors and omitted one so that all three factors will be divided into 10 items. The revised scale is now composed of thirty items with ten items per factor. All these items are stated and the option will be given in five Likert scale options. Followings are the explanation about the three items and the indicators of the factor.

I. Item for bank of knowledge

Students who participate in peer dialogue under the bank of knowledge factors will show the following indicators:

- a) The student listen to the teacher's lecture about the topic and the instruction carefully
- b) The student always takes down notes.
- c) The student usually raise his hand to ask questions when the teacher discusses the lesson.
- d) The student contributes to the to the classroom activities by reciting or demonstrating the lesson in front of the class.
- e) The student participates in the class discussion despite the size of the class.
- f) The student practice peer dialogue despite unclear task of the lesson.
- g) The student actively answers the friend's question during peer dialogue.
- h) The student makes comment during peer dialogue only when the teacher invites the class to do so.

- i) The student answers the question, even though the question was directed to someone else.
- j) The student comments aloud during peer dialogue, even though the chance was given to someone else.

II. Civil Attention

The students who participate in peer-dialogue under civil attention factors are the students who actually do not participate by they do the following items in order to mask their participation:

- a) The student makes efforts in attending class on time.
- b) The student keeps quiet during lesson time and peer dialogue time.
- c) The student doodles or draws in her/his book while peer dialogue is going on.
- d) The students prefer written assignment than performing peer dialogue
- e) The student daydreams during peer dialogue or class activities.
- f) The students wait the teacher to call them to practice peer dialogue in front of the class.
- g) The student prefers to listen to other students' conversation rather than perform the dialogue.
- h) The student talks to her/his seatmates about other things than the lesson.
- i) The student read other texts during peer dialogue.
- j) The student tries to maintain eye contact with peers while performing peer dialogue.

III. Items for Knowledge transmission factor:

- a) The student listens attentively in class as a form of self-review.
- b) The student have the material that will be used in the lesson.
- c) The student takes down notes that consist of important vocabularies during peer dialogue.
- d) The student asks the teacher when she/he does not understand the lesson.
- e) The student listens and repeats the teacher's example during peer dialogue.
- f) The student corrects other student's mistaken definitions of key terms.
- g) The student listens well and mentally repeats when the teacher explains the concept or the lesson.
- h) The students tell others if they make mistakes while performing peer dialogue.
- i) The student talks and makes noise while memorizing the terminologies or phrases in peer dialogue.
- j) The student writes the vocabularies and the dialogue of peer dialogue accurately in order to avoid misunderstanding in the usage.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This descriptive study has one variable. This study is aimed to describe the students' participation in peer dialogue at the third year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru.

B. Location and Time of the Research

The research has been conducted at the third year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru. This research has been conducted from April through August 2010.

C. Subject and Object of the Research

The subject of the research was the third year students of AL-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru, and the object of the research was the students' participation in peer dialogue.

D. Population and Sample

The population of this study is all of the third year students of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru. There are three classes and total population is 107 students. In this case, Suharsimi said that if population is less than 100 respondents we can take all of, but if more than 100 respondents we can take 10% - 15% or 20% - 25% or more than. The researcher decided to take more than 25% of the population as the sample.¹ Thus, the researcher took 30 students as the sample. Because the sample of this research take by using total random

¹ Suharsimi Arikuntu. 2007. *Populasi dan Sampel*. p. 219

sampling, so the sample was 10 students of every class. Following is the table that showed the distribution of the population and the numbers of the sample.

Table III.1
Population and Sample of the Research

No.	Class	Population	Sample
1	XII A	35	10
2	XII B	35	10
3	XII C	37	10
Total		107	30

E. Techniques of Data Collection

The researcher used the questionnaire of Howard, Short and Clarek that has been modified by Almanzor. There questionnaire consists of thirty three questions that convey the three factors in participation, namely bank of knowledge, civil attention, and knowledge transmission. There are ten items for each factor. All of these items are stated and the answers in the scoring scale of likert. Therefore, the options will be scored as seen in the following table.²

Table III. 2
Scale of the Score

No.	Option	Score
1	Always	5
2	Often	4
3	Sometimes	3
4	Seldom	2

² Almanzor, et.al. 2009. *The Assessment Handbook*, Vol.2. p.44

5	Never	1
---	-------	---

The distributions of the questionnaire can be seen as follow:

Table III. 3

The Classification of Questions

The Classification of Questions	Number of questions	Total Question
Bank of knowledge	1;2;3;4;5;6;7;8;9;10	10
Civil Attention	11;12;13;14;15;16;17;18;19;20	10
Knowledge transmission	21;22;23;24;25;26;27;28;29;30	10
Total		30

F. Technique of Data Analysis

In this study the expected number of which the percentage is interpreted into qualitative words, thus the technique is called as the study qualitative by percentage. The data will be analyzed by descriptive and qualitative, using the following formula (Adopted from Anas Sudjiono):³

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentage of the students classified in major group.

F = Total score of respondents classified in each element.

N = Total number of respondent.

³ Anas Sudjiono, 1987. *Tehnik Data Analisis*. p. 40

And the students' participation will be categorized into the following classification:⁴

Table III.2
The Students' Participation in Peer Dialogue

No.	Score	Category
1	80 - 100	Excellent
2	70 - 79	High
3	60 - 69	Enough
4	50 - 59	Poor
5	0 - 49	Very low

⁴ Almanzor, et.al. 2009. *The Assessment Handbook*, Vol.2. p.46

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A. Data Presentation

This is a descriptive research. The researcher used questionnaire in order to get the data about the students' participation in peer dialogue. After the questionnaire distributed to the students randomly, and the students answered, the researcher input the data into the table and then interpreted the data into some conclusion.

1) Data of the Questionnaire

1. The students listen to the instructions carefully before conducting peer dialogue.

Table IV.1
The students listen to the teacher's lecture about the topic and the instruction carefully

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	5	4	13.3%
Often	4	6	20%
Sometimes	3	10	33.3%
Seldom	2	2	6.7%
Never	1	8	26.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table VI.I above, it can be seen that majority (33.3%) students sometimes listen to the teacher's lecture about the topic and the instruction during teaching and learning process carefully. In contrast, there are about 26.7% of the students never listen the teacher's instruction carefully. And the

rest of the students (20%, 13.3%, and 6.7%) often, always and seldom listen to the teacher's instruction respectively.

2. The student always takes down notes during peer dialogue and discussion.

Table IV.2

The students take down notes in peer dialogue and discussion

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	11	36.7%
Sometimes	3	8	26.7%
Seldom	4	3	10%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Table IV.2 above shows that majority (36.7%) of the students often take down notes during peer dialogue and classroom discussion. The rest of the students, 26.7% sometimes also take notes during peer dialogue and class discussion. While the rest of them (16.7%) never take down notes.

3. The students raise their hand to ask questions in peer dialogue.

Table IV.3

The Students raise their hands to ask questions in peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	2	6.7%
Often	2	6	20%
Sometimes	3	12	40%
Seldom	4	3	10%
Never	5	7	23.3%
Total		30	100%

Table IV.3 above shows that majority of the students (40%) sometimes raise their hands in order to ask questions in peer dialogue. In contrast, there are about 23.3% of the students who never raise their hands in order to ask questions in peer dialogue.

4. The student contributes to the to the classroom activities by reciting or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class.

Table IV.4
Students contribute by reciting or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	1	3.3%
Often	2	2	6.7%
Sometimes	3	17	56.7%
Seldom	4	2	6.7%
Never	5	8	26.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.4, it can be said that majority of the students (56.7%) sometimes contribute to the classroom activities by reciting or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class. On the other hand, there are about 26.7% of the students, who never contribute to the classroom either by reciting or by practicing peer dialogue in front of the classroom.

5. The student participates in peer dialogue despite the size of the class.

Table IV.5

Students participate in peer dialogue despite the size of the class

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	1	3.3%
Often	2	5	16.7%
Sometimes	3	6	20%
Seldom	4	13	43.3%
Never	5	6	20%
Total		30	100%

Based on Table IV.5 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (43.3%) seldom participate in peer dialogue despite the size of the class. And there are about 20% of the students who choose sometimes and never participate in peer dialogue despite the size of the class. 16.7% of the students often participate on peer dialogue, and there is only 3.3% students who participate in peer dialogue no matter how big the size of the class is.

6. The student practice peer dialogue despite unclear concept of topic in the class

Table IV.6

Students practice peer dialogue despite unclear task of the lesson

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	5	16.7%
Often	2	12	40%
Sometimes	3	8	26.7%
Seldom	4	4	13.3%
Never	5	1	3.3%
Total		30	100%

Table IV.6 above shows that majority of the students (40%) often participate by practicing peer dialogue even though the task is not clearly defined, and (26.7%) sometimes practice peer dialogue despite unclear task of the lesson in the class. There is only 3.3% of the students do not participate in practicing peer dialogue when the task is unclearly defined

7. The students actively answer the friends' question during peer dialogue.

Table IV.7

Students actively answer the friends' questions during peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	5	16.7%
Often	2	6	20%
Sometimes	3	11	36.7%
Seldom	4	3	10%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Table IV.7 above clearly show that most of the students (36.7%) sometimes actively answer their friends' question during peer dialogue time. And there are 20% of them often answer their friends' questions actively. And there are about 16.7% of them who never actively answer their friends' question during peer dialogue time.

8. The students make comment during peer dialogue only when the teacher invites the class to do so.

Table IV.8

Students give comment during peer dialogue only when the teacher invites the class to do so

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	6	20%
Sometimes	3	10	33.3%
Seldom	4	6	20%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on the explanation on table IV.8 above, it can be said that most of the students (33.3%) sometimes will give their comments in peer dialogue only if they are requested to do so. As the comparison, 20% of the students often give comments in peer dialogue and 20% of them also seldom give comment in peer dialogue although they are requested to do so.

9. The student answers the question, even though the question was directed to someone else.

Table IV.9

Students answer the question even though it's directed to someone else

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	4	13.3%
Often	2	8	26.7%
Sometimes	3	10	33.3%
Seldom	4	6	20%
Never	5	2	6.7%
Total		30	100%

Table IV.9 above clearly stated that majority of the students (33.3%) sometimes answer the question even though it was directed to other students. And there is only 6.7% of the students who never answer the question when it was directed to another students.

10. The students comment aloud, even though the chance was given to someone else.

Table IV.10
Students comment aloud even though the chance was given to someone else

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	12	40%
Sometimes	3	8	26.7%
Seldom	4	5	16.7%
Never	5	2	6.7%
Total		30	100%

Table IV.10 above shows that majority of the students (40%) sometimes give their comment loudly even though the chance to give comment was directed to other students, and 26.7% of them sometimes give their comment in this occasion, and there is only 6.7% of them who never give their comment loudly if the chance was given to other students.

11. The students make efforts in attending class on time.

Table IV.11

Students make efforts in attending class on time

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	5	16.7%
Often	2	11	36.7%
Sometimes	3	6	20%
Seldom	4	5	16.7%
Never	5	3	10%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.11 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (36.7%) often make their effort to attend their English class on time. And 20% of the students sometimes make their effort in attending the class on time, while only 10% of the students seem to never make effort to attend the class on time.

12. The students keep quiet during lesson time and peer dialogue time.

Table IV.12

Students keep quiet during lesson time and peer dialogue time

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	13.3%
Often	2	4	20%
Sometimes	3	11	36.7%
Seldom	4	8	16.7%
Never	5	4	20%
Total		30	100%

Surprisingly, majority of the students (36.7%) students sometimes keep quiet during lesson time and peer dialogue time. And there are about 20% of the students who will often keep silent, and there are also 20% of them who will never keep quiet during lesson time and peer dialogue time.

13. The students doodle or draw in their books while peer dialogue is going on.

Table IV.13

Students doodle or draw in their books while peer dialogue is going on

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	5	16.7%
Often	2	13	43.3%
Sometimes	3	6	20%
Seldom	4	2	6.7%
Never	5	1	3.3%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.13 above, it can be seen clearly that majority of the students (43.3%) often spend their time by doodling or drawing in their books while peer dialogue is going on. 20% of the students sometimes doodle and draw in their book during peer dialogue time, and there is only 3.3% of them who never spend their time for doodling or drawing on their books while peer dialogue is going on.

14. The students prefer written assignment than performing peer dialogue.

Table IV. 14

Students prefer written assignment than performing peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	8	26.7%
Sometimes	3	10	33.3%
Seldom	4	6	20%
Never	5	3	10%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.14 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (33.3%) sometimes prefer doing written assignment rather than performing peer dialogue. Most of them (26.7%) often prefer doing written assignment rather than peer dialogue, and only 10% of the students who never prefer written assignment than peer dialogue.

15. The students daydream during peer dialogue or class activities.

Table IV.15

The students daydream during peer dialogue or class activities

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	12	40%
Sometimes	3	6	20%
Seldom	4	8	26.7%
Never	5	1	3.3%
Total		30	100%

Based on the description of table IV.15 above, it can be said that majority of the students (40%) often daydream during peer dialogue time or during other class activities. And in contrast there are 26.7% of the students who seldom daydream during peer dialogue or class activities time.

16. The students wait for the teacher to call them to recite or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class.

Table IV. 16
Students wait for teacher to call them to recite or practicing peer
dialogue in front of the class.

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	6	20%
Often	2	11	36.7%
Sometimes	3	4	13.3%
Seldom	4	6	20%
Never	5	3	10%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.16 above, it can be said that majority of the students (36.7%) often wait for the teacher to call them to recite or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class. And there are about 20% of the students who always waiting for the teacher to call their names before reciting or practicing peer dialogue in front of the class, and there are also 20% of the students who seldom wait for the teacher's call. And only 10% of the students who do not wait the teacher's call when they want to recite or practice peer dialogue in front of the class.

17. The students prefer to listen to other students' conversation rather than perform the dialogue.

Table IV.17
The students prefer to listen to other students' conversation rather than perform the dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	4	13.3%
Often	2	5	16.7%
Sometimes	3	6	20%
Seldom	4	10	33.3%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.17 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (33.3%) seldom listen to other students' conversation rather than perform the dialogue. In contrary, 20% of the students sometimes prefer listening to their friends' conversation rather than performing peer dialogue themselves. And only 16.7% of the students who never prefer listening to their friends' conversation than performing the dialogue.

18. The students talk to seatmates about other things than the lesson.

Table IV. 18
Students talk to seatmates about other things than the lesson

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	2	6.7%
Often	2	5	16.7%
Sometimes	3	11	36.7%
Seldom	4	6	20%
Never	5	6	20%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.18 above, majority of the students (36.7%) sometimes talk to their seatmates about other things than the lesson. And 20% of the students seldom talk to their seatmates, and 20% of them never talk to seatmates other things than the lesson during peer dialogue time.

19. The students read other texts during peer dialogue.

Table IV. 19
Students read other texts during peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	11	36.7%
Sometimes	3	8	26.7%
Seldom	4	3	10%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.19 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (36.7%) often reading other texts during peer dialogue time. 26.7% of the students sometimes read other texts during peer dialogue time. And there is only 16.7% of the students who never read other texts during peer dialogue time.

20. The students try to maintain eye contact with the peer while performing peer dialogue.

Table IV. 20
Students try to maintain eye contact with the peer while performing peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	11	36.7%
Sometimes	3	8	26.7%
Seldom	4	3	10%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.20 above, majority of the students (36.7%) often try to maintain eye contact with their peers while performing peer dialogue. 26.7% of the students also sometimes maintain eye contact with their peer during peer dialogue. And there is only 16.7% of the students who never try to maintain eye contacts with their peer while performing peer dialogue.

21. The students listen attentively in class as a form of self-review.

Table IV. 21
Students listen attentively in class as a form of self-review

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	2	6.7%
Often	2	6	20%
Sometimes	3	12	40%
Seldom	4	3	10%
Never	5	7	23.3%
Total		30	100%

Based on the explanation on table IV.21 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (40%) sometimes listen to the lesson attentively as the form of self-review. In contrast, there are 23.3% of the students who never listen attentively during the lesson.

22. The students have the material that will be used in the lesson.

Table IV. 22

Students have the material that will be used in the lesson

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	1	3.3%
Often	2	2	6.7%
Sometimes	3	17	56.7%
Seldom	4	2	6.7%
Never	5	8	26.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.22 above, majority of the students (56.7%) sometimes have the material that will be used in the lesson. In contrary, there are about 26.7% of the students who never have the material to be used in the lesson.

23. The students take down notes that consist important vocabularies during peer dialogue.

Table IV. 23

Students take down notes that consists important vocabularies during peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	0	0%
Often	2	5	16.7%

Sometimes	3	6	20%
Seldom	4	13	43.3%
Never	5	6	20%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.23 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (43.3%) seldom take notes consisting important vocabularies during peer dialogue. Only 16.7% of the students who often take down the important vocabulary during peer dialogue. And 20% of the students tend to sometimes, even never take down notes consisting important vocabularies during peer dialogue time.

24. The students ask the teacher when they do not understand the lesson.

Table IV.24

Students ask the teacher when they do not understand the lesson

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	5	16.7%
Often	2	12	40%
Sometimes	3	8	26.7%
Seldom	4	4	13.3%
Never	5	1	3.3%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.24 above, majority of the students (40%) will often ask the teacher when they do not understand the lesson. 16.7% of them will always ask question to the teacher whenever they do not understand the lesson, and only 3.3% of the students who never ask the question to the teacher even though they do not understand the lesson.

25. The students listen and repeat the teacher's example during peer dialogue.

Table IV. 25

Students listen and repeat the teacher's example during peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	5	16.7%
Often	2	6	20%
Sometimes	3	11	36.7%
Seldom	4	3	10%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.25 above, it can be said that majority of the students (36.7%) sometimes listen and repeat the teacher's example during peer dialogue. And 20% of the students often follow and listen to the teacher's example during peer dialogue, and only 16.7% of the students who never listen nor repeat the teacher's example in conducting peer dialogue.

26. The students correct other students' mistaken definitions of key terms.

Table IV. 26

Students correct other students' mistaken definitions of key terms

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	6	20%
Sometimes	3	10	33.3%
Seldom	4	6	20%
Never	5	5	16.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.26 above, it can be seen that majority of the students (33.3%) sometimes help their friends correcting the mistaken definition of key terms in learning English, especially in peer dialogue. And 20% of the students also often correct their friends' mistakes in defining the key term, but there is also 20% of the students who seldom helping their friend develop the correct definition of key terms.

27. The students listen well and mentally repeat when the teacher explains the concept or the lesson.

Table IV. 27
Students listen well and mentally repeat the teacher's explanation

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	4	13.3%
Often	2	8	26.7%
Sometimes	3	10	33.3%
Seldom	4	6	20%
Never	5	2	6.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.27 above, majority of the students (33.3%) sometimes listen well and mentally repeat the teacher's explanation about the lesson. The rest of the students, (26.7%) often listen well and mentally repeat the teacher's explanation, and only 6.7% of the students who never listen well nor mentally repeat the teacher's concept or explanation about the lesson.

28. The students tell others if they make mistakes while performing peer dialogue.

Table IV. 28
Students tell others if they make mistakes while performing peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	10%
Often	2	12	40%
Sometimes	3	8	26.7%
Seldom	4	5	16.7%
Never	5	2	6.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.28 above, it can be said that majority of the students (40%) often help their friends by telling them when they make mistakes in performing peer dialogue. And 26.7% of the students sometimes try to help by telling their friends about their mistakes in performing peer dialogue. In contrary, 6.7% of the students never correct their friends' mistake while performing peer dialogue.

29. The students talk and make noise while memorizing the terminologies or phrases in peer dialogue.

Table IV. 29
Students talk and make noise while memorizing the terminologies or phrases in peer dialogue

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	5	16.7%
Often	2	11	36.7%
Sometimes	3	6	20%
Seldom	4	5	16.7%
Never	5	3	10%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.29 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (36.7%) will often talk and make noise while memorizing the terminologies or phrases in peer dialogue. 20% of the students sometimes make noise and talk while working with the terminologies or phrases in peer dialogue. Only 10% of the students who never talk nor make noise when they are working with terminologies or phrases in peer dialogue.

30. The students write the vocabularies and dialogue of peer dialogue accurately in order to avoid misunderstanding.

Table IV. 30
Students write the vocabularies and dialogue of peer dialogue accurately in order to avoid misunderstanding

Alternative	Score	Frequency	P
Always	1	3	13.3%
Often	2	4	20%
Sometimes	3	11	36.7%

Seldom	4	8	16.7%
Never	5	4	20%
Total		30	100%

Based on table IV.30 above, it can be said that majority of the students (36.7%) sometimes write vocabularies and dialogue of peer dialogue accurately in order to avoid misunderstanding. In contrary, there are about 20% of students who never write down any vocabularies or dialogue that is important in peer dialogue.

2) Recapitulation of the students' answer per category

a. Bank of knowledge

TABLE IV. 31
BANK OF KNOWLEDGE

Alternatives	Frequency	P
Always	30	10%
Often	74	24.7%
Sometimes	100	33.3%
Seldom	47	15.7%
Never	49	16.3%
Total		100%

Based on table IV.32 above, it can be said, for the Bank of Knowledge category, majority of the students (33.3%) choose options “Sometimes”, and 24.7% of the students choose option “Often”, 16.3% of the students choose option “Never”, and 15.7% choose option “Seldom”, only 10% of the students choose option “Always”.

b. Civil Attention

TABLE IV. 32
CIVIL ATTENTION

Alternatives	Frequency	P
Always	38	12.7%
Often	86	28.7%
Sometimes	78	26%
Seldom	56	18.7%
Never	42	14%
Total		100%

Based on the explanation on table IV.33, it can be concluded that majority of the students (28.7%) choose option “Often” for civil attention category. And 26% of the students choose option “Sometimes”, 18.7% of the students choose “Seldom”, 14% of the students choose option “Never” and only 12.7% of them choose option “Always”

c. Knowledge Transmission

TABLE IV. 33
KNOWLEDGE TRANSMISSION

Alternatives	Frequency	P
Always	31	10.3%
Often	72	24%
Sometimes	99	33%
Seldom	55	18.3%
Never	43	14.3%
Total		100%

Based on the explanation on table IV. 34 above, it can be concluded that majority of the students (33%) choose option “Sometimes” in knowledge transmission category. 24% of the students choose option “Often”, 18,3% of the students choose option “Seldom”, and 14.3% of the students choose option “Never”, the rest of the students (10.3%) choose option “Always”.

B. Data Analysis

1) Data Analysis for the Questionnaire

The researcher investigated the data collected and analyzed them based on the formulation of the problems. The researcher analyzed the students’ participation in peer dialogue.

To investigate how is the students’ participation in peer dialogue at the third year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru, the researcher used descriptive qualitative analysis technique by using percentage. Hence, the alternatives in the questionnaire are standardized based on the Likert scale. The categories of the alternatives can be seen as follows:

Table IV. 34
Scale of the Score

No.	Option	Score
1	Always	5
2	Often	4
3	Sometimes	3
4	Seldom	2
5	Never	1

The data are going to be investigated in order to get qualitative analysis result. Then, the researcher counted the percentage of the students' participation in peer dialogue. To find out the result, the researcher used the formula as follows:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentage of the students classified in major group.

F = Total score of respondents classified in each element.

N = Total number of respondent.

Based on the data presentation on table IV. 31, the calculation of the questionnaire can be done as following:

Option "Always"	=	99 x 5	=	495
Option "Often"	=	232 x 4	=	928
Option "Sometimes"	=	277 x 3	=	831
Option "Seldom"	=	158 x 2	=	316
Option "Never"	=	134 x 1	=	134

Based on the calculation above, the total number of F is = 495 + 928 + 831 + 316 + 134 = 900, and total of N is = 99 + 232 + 277 + 158 + 134 = 2704. To find out the percentage of the result, so 900 is multiple with 5, the highest item's score, and the result is 4500. This data is analyzed by the formula as follows:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

$$P = \frac{900}{4500} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 0,60089 \times 100\%$$

$$P = 60,09\%$$

Since 60, 09% is found in the enough categories (60 – 79), in other words, it can be said that the participation of the students at the third year of Al-Kautsar Isalmic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru in peer dialogue is enough. The students do participate in peer dialogue.

2) Data Analysis Based on the Category of the Participation

a. Bank of Knowledge Category

Table IV.35
Students' response for bank of knowledge category

Alternatives	Score	Frequency	Total
Always	5	30	150
Often	4	74	296
Sometimes	3	100	300
Seldom	2	47	94
Never	1	49	49
Total		(10 questions for 30 students)	889

Based on table IV. 35 above, it can be seen that the overall score for bank of knowledge category is 889. 100 students choose option “sometimes” to represent them for bank of knowledge category.

b. Civil Attention category

Table IV. 36

Students’ Responses for Civil Attention Category

Alternatives	Score	Frequency	Total
Always	5	38	190
Often	4	86	344
Sometimes	3	78	234
Seldom	2	56	112
Never	1	42	42
Total		(10 questions for 30 students)	922

Based on table IV.36 above, it can be clearly seen that majority of the students choose option “often” with the highest frequency in civil attention category.

c. Knowledge transmission category

Table IV. 37

Students’ Response for Knowledge Transmission Category

Alternatives	Score	Frequency	Total
Always	5	31	155
Often	4	72	288
Sometimes	3	99	297
Seldom	2	55	110
Never	1	43	43
Total		(10 questions for 30 students)	893

Based on table IV. 37 above, it can be concluded that for category of knowledge transmission, majority of the students choose option “sometimes”.

The comparison of those three categories can be clearly seen on the following:

1. The total score for bank of knowledge category is 889
2. The total score for civil attention category is 922
3. And the total score for knowledge transmission is 893.

So, the category of the students’ participation in peer dialogue at the third year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru is in *civil attention* category. It means that majority of the students tend to not actively participate in peer dialogue and they do some other activities as mentioned in civil attention category in order to mask up and pretend that they do participate in the peer dialogue during learning and teaching process.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

In teaching and learning process, it is considered the importance of interaction in the classroom. The theories suggested that the implementation of appropriate interaction during learning and teaching process will benefit the students and achieve the goal of teaching and learning more effectively and efficiently. Peer dialogue can help students with various abilities to accomplish learning goals, solve the problems, and practice the language more intensively.

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the level of students' participation in peer dialogue activities in English learning process is categorized as *enough* where 60,09% will be found in the category of *enough* (60 – 79). And the category of the students' participation in peer dialogue at the third year of Al-Kautsar Islamic Boarding School Kulim – Pekanbaru is in *civil attention category*. It means that the students pay enough attention in participating in peer dialogue during the lesson, but because their participation is in enough category, they do some other activities such as doodling, daydreaming, talking or sometimes reading other text during peer dialogue time in order to mask their lack of participation.

B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion of the research, hence the researcher suggested the following:

1. Suggestion for teacher

Peer dialogue has been proven to be one of the communicative methods of learning which allows the students to practice the language and personalize the instruction during English teaching and learning time. If we have to make comparison between whole class practice and peer dialogue, we will see that in peer dialogue students will get more opportunity to practice the language, and help each other.

By conducting this research, the writer suggests the teacher to use different communicative methods in order the students can practice their language. In doing peer dialogue, as one of the easiest and more advantageous methods in teaching the students practicing the language, the teacher should clearly define the instruction, so that all the students understand the expectation and the instruction of the lesson, so there will be no more students chat or doing other things than practicing the language with their peers.

Some of the students are brave enough to be the volunteer to demonstrate peer dialogue in front of the class, but most of them needs the teacher to encourage them, or even invite them to practice peer dialogue in front of the class. The teacher should be able to differentiate this kind of students so that all of the students in the class get equal opportunity to demonstrate peer dialogue effectively during learning and teaching process.

2. Suggestion for the students

Based on the result of the research, the writer can give the following suggestion for the students.

- The use of peer dialogue is aimed to increase the students' opportunity to practice the language with their peers, so the students have to use this chance maximally in order to understand and practice the language freely without being afraid of making mistakes.
- During peer dialogue time, students who do not understand the lesson or the instruction should not keep silent. They have to do something in order to get better understanding about the lesson, the concepts or the vocabularies. These students can ask question to the teacher, or ask question to their peers.
- In peer dialogue, the students must be able to express their opinion and communicate with their peer effectively and freely.
- The students should notice that learning a language should not only focus on getting good grades, but they should also notice that the use of the language is also important for their future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alhaidari, Mohammed. S., 2006. *The Effectiveness of Using Cooperative Learning to Promote Reading Comprehension, Vocabulary and Fluency Achievement Scores of Male Fourth-and Fifth-Grade Students in A Saudi Arabian School*. Pennsylvania, Unpublished Dissertation.
- Almanzor, Sylvelyn Jo A, et al. 2009. *The Assessment Handbook, Vol. 2 - Student's Attitude Towards Participation During Class Time*. Philippines.
- Brown, Douglas H, Donn, Byrne. 1987. *Techniques for Classroom Interaction*. Longman. New Jersey.
- Byrne, Donn. 1987. *Techniques for Classroom Interaction - Longman Keys to Language Teaching*. Longman. New Jersey.
- Corden, Roy. 2001. *Group discussion and the importance of a shared perspective: learning from collaborative research*. SAGE Publication. London.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. 1999. Structure academic controversy. In S. Sharan (Ed.). *Handbook of cooperative learning methods* (pp. 66-81). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Kim, Tae Young and Hyo Sun Seo. 2011. *Collaborative Dialogue and L2 Learning; Korean Junior High School Students' Pair Work in English Composition*. Korean Journal of Applied Linguistic, Vol. 27, No. 1.
- Klingner, J.K., Vaughn, S. & Schumm, J.S. 1998. Collaborative strategic reading during social studies in heterogonous fourth-grade classroom. *The Elementary School Journal*, 99(1), 3-22.
- Long, Michael H., Patricia A. Porter.1985. *Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition*. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2. (Jun., 1985), pp. 207-228.
- Maurer, Caroline. 2008. *Peer Dialogue at Literacy Centers in One-First Grade Classroom*. The Ohio State University. Unpublished Dissertation. Ohio.
- Remedios, Luisa, David Clarke and Lesleyanne Hawthorne. 2008. *The Silent Participant in Small Group Collaborative Learning Context*. SAGE Publication. Los Angeles.

- Sakdiyah, Efa, M. 2006 *Pengaruh Motivasi, Disiplin, dan Partisipasi Siswa dalam Pembelajaran terhadap Prestasi Belajar Akuntansi Siswa Kelas XI IPSs SMA Negeri 1 Tayu Pati Semester II t.a 2005/2006*. Universitas Negeri Malang. Unpublished Thesis.
- Sastropoetro, Santoso. 1989. *Partisipasi, Komunikasi, Persuasi dan Disiplin dalam Pembangunan Nasional*. Alumni. Bandung in Sakdiyah, Efa, M. 2006 *Pengaruh Motivasi, Disiplin, dan Partisipasi Siswa dalam Pembelajaran terhadap Prestasi Belajar Akuntansi Siswa Kelas XI IPSs SMA Negeri 1 Tayu Pati Semester II t.a 2005/2006*. Universitas Negeri Malang. Unpublished Thesis.
- Stevens, R. 1994. *Cooperative learning and literacy instruction*. In N. J. Ellsworth, C. N. Hedley, & A.N. Baratta. *Literacy: A redefinition* pp. 127-158. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. In Kim Tae Young and Hyo Sun Seo. *Collaborative Dialogue and L2 Learning*. Korean Journal Vol 27. March 2011.
- Williams, Pia. 2001 'Children's Ways of Experiencing Peer Interaction', *Early Child Development and Care*, 168:1, 17 – 38. From [//dx.doi.org/10.1080/0300443011680102](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0300443011680102)
- Zuherni. 2008. *The Correlation Between Students' Mastery of Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Text at Second Year Students of SMAN 1 Sabak Auh, Siak Sri Indrapura*. Pekanbaru: Tarbiyah UIN SUSKA Riau.